

Mar 28, 2018

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

PATRICK JOHN PAGE,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

No. 2:17-CV-00067-SMJ

**ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S SUMMARY
JUDGMENT MOTION AND
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION**

Plaintiff Patrick John Page appeals the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) denial of his application for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. He alleges that the ALJ improperly (1) failed to consider his eligibility for Listing 12.05C, (2) found his symptom testimony not credible, and (3) discounted the opinions of several medical providers. The ALJ did not find that Mr. Page's borderline IQ was a severe impairment at step two and therefore was not required to consider Listing 12.05C at step three. The ALJ gave specific reasons, supported by substantial evidence, for rejecting Page's symptom testimony and for his consideration of the medical opinions. Defendant's motion for summary judgment is therefore granted.

1 **I. BACKGROUND¹**

2 Patrick Page filed an application for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) on
3 February 27, 2013, alleging disability beginning August 15, 2011. AR 205–30. His
4 claim was denied initially and upon reconsideration. AR 149–52. Page requested a
5 hearing on September 11, 2015, and a hearing was held on July 22, 2015. AR 170–
6 71, 48–89. Page amended the onset date of his claim to August 15, 2012, at the
7 hearing. AR 13, 54. The ALJ issued an unfavorable decision on August 6, 2015.
8 AR 10–37. The Appeals Council denied Page’s request for review, AR 1–7, and he
9 timely appealed to this Court. ECF No. 1.

10 **II. DISABILITY DETERMINATION**

11 A “disability” is defined as the “inability to engage in any substantial gainful
12 activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment
13 which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to
14 last for a continuous period of not less than twelve months.” 42 U.S.C. §§
15 423(d)(1)(A), 1382c(a)(3)(A). The decision-maker uses a five-step sequential
16 evaluation process to determine whether a claimant is disabled. 20 C.F.R. §§
17 404.1520, 416.920.

18
19
20

¹ The facts are only briefly summarized. Detailed facts are contained in the administrative hearing transcript, the ALJ’s decision, and the parties’ briefs.

1 Step one assesses whether the claimant is engaged in substantial gainful
2 activities. If he is, benefits are denied. 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(b), 416.920(b). If he
3 is not, the decision-maker proceeds to step two.

4 Step two assesses whether the claimant has a medically severe impairment
5 or combination of impairments. 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(c), 416.920(c). If the
6 claimant does not, the disability claim is denied. If the claimant does, the evaluation
7 proceeds to the third step.

8 Step three compares the claimant's impairment with a number of listed
9 impairments acknowledged by the Commissioner to be so severe as to preclude
10 substantial gainful activity. 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(d), 404 Subpt. P App. 1,
11 416.920(d). If the impairment meets or equals one of the listed impairments, the
12 claimant is conclusively presumed to be disabled. If the impairment does not, the
13 evaluation proceeds to the fourth step.

14 Step four assesses whether the impairment prevents the claimant from
15 performing work he has performed in the past by examining the claimant's residual
16 functional capacity. 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(e), 416.920(e). If the claimant is able
17 to perform his previous work, he is not disabled. If the claimant cannot perform
18 this work, the evaluation proceeds to the fifth step.

19 Step five, the final step, assesses whether the claimant can perform other
20 work in the national economy in view of his age, education, and work experience.

20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(f), 416.920(f); *see Bowen v. Yuckert*, 482 U.S. 137 (1987).

If the claimant can, the disability claim is denied. If the claimant cannot, the disability claim is granted.

The burden of proof shifts during this sequential disability analysis. The claimant has the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of entitlement to disability benefits. *Rhinehart v. Finch*, 438 F.2d 920, 921 (9th Cir. 1971). The burden then shifts to the Commissioner to show 1) the claimant can perform other substantial gainful activity, and 2) that a “significant number of jobs exist in the national economy,” which the claimant can perform. *Kail v. Heckler*, 722 F.2d 1496, 1498 (9th Cir. 1984). A claimant is disabled only if his impairments are of such severity that he is not only unable to do his previous work but cannot, considering his age, education, and work experiences, engage in any other substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. 42 U.S.C. §§ 423(d)(2)(A), 1382c(a)(3)(B).

III. ALJ FINDINGS

At step one, the ALJ found that Page had not engaged in substantial gainful activity since August 15, 2012. AR 15. At step two, the ALJ concluded that Page had the following medically determinable severe impairments: degenerative disc disease of the cervical and lumbar spine, pain disorder, depression and anxiety. *Id.* The ALJ noted that Page had complaints of abdominal pain, COPD, and carpal

1 tunnel syndrome, but found that none of these conditions were severe
2 impairments. AR 16. The ALJ also noted that Page had borderline intellectual
3 functioning as indicated by his performance on intellectual testing (borderline
4 range FSIQ of 73 and Verbal Comprehension of 72, AR 529–32). However, the
5 ALJ noted that, based on the record as a whole—including, most notably, Page’s
6 history of several years performing semi-skilled work—Page’s performance on
7 the FSIQ test “is not determinative of his functional capacity, and that he has no
8 worse than moderate limitations in that regard.” AR 16.

9 At step three, the ALJ found that Page did not have an impairment or
10 combination of impairments that met or medically equaled the severity of a listed
11 impairment. AR 17–18. At step four, the ALJ found that Page had the residual
12 functional capacity to perform a full range of light work with some additional
13 limitations. AR 18–28. In reaching this conclusion, the ALJ found that Page’s
14 medically determinable impairments could reasonably be expected to cause the
15 alleged symptoms, but he found that some of Page’s statements concerning the
16 intensity, persistence and limiting effects were not entirely credible. AR 19–20. In
17 determining Page’s physical capacity, the ALJ gave significant weight to state
18 agency medical consultant, Dr. Alexander. AR 25. The ALJ gave minimal weight
19 to the opinion of DSHS consultative examining physician, Dr. Shanks. AR 25–26.
20 In determining Page’s mental functionality, the ALJ gave little weight to DSHS

1 consultative examining psychologist, Dr. Brown. The ALJ gave minimal weight
2 to the opinions of Page's girlfriend. The ALJ did not consider opinions issued
3 before the relevant period. AR 26–28.

4 At step five, the ALJ found that Page is unable to perform any past relevant
5 work and that there are jobs that exist in significant numbers in the national
6 economy that he could perform. AR 28–29.

7 IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW

8 The Court must uphold an ALJ's determination that a claimant is not disabled
9 if the ALJ applied the proper legal standards and there is substantial evidence in the
10 record as a whole to support the decision. *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104, 1110
11 (9th Cir. 2012) (citing *Stone v. Heckler*, 761 F.2d 530, 531 (9th Cir.1985)).
12 "Substantial evidence 'means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might
13 accept as adequate to support a conclusion.'" *Id.* at 1110 (quoting *Valentine v.*
14 *Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 574 F.3d 685, 690 (9th Cir. 2009)). This must be more
15 than a mere scintilla, but may be less than a preponderance. *Id.* at 1110–11 (citation
16 omitted). Even where the evidence supports more than one rational interpretation,
17 the Court must uphold an ALJ's decision if it is supported by inferences reasonably
18 drawn from the record. *Id.*; *Allen v. Heckler*, 749 F.2d 577, 579 (9th Cir. 1984).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

V. ANALYSIS

Page argues that the ALJ erred in step three by failing to consider whether he meets listing 12.05C, which addresses intellectual disability. ECF 12. He also argues that the ALJ erred in determining his residual functional capacity at step four by (1) finding his testimony not credible, and (2) improperly discounting the opinions of several medical providers. *Id.* The ALJ did not err in failing to consider Page's eligibility under listing 12.05C or in assessing Page's residual functional capacity at step four. Accordingly, the ALJ's decision must be upheld.

A. The ALJ did not err in failing to consider whether Mr. Page's impairments met listing 12.05C.

Page asserts that the ALJ failed to properly consider whether he met listing 12.05C at step three of the analysis. A claimant satisfies Listing 12.05C if he can show: (1) subaverage intellectual functioning with deficits in adaptive functioning initially manifested before age 22; (2) a valid IQ score of 60 to 70; and (3) a physical or other mental impairment imposing an additional and significant work-related limitation. *See* 20 C.F.R. pt. 404, subpt. P, app. 1, § 12.05C; *Kennedy v. Colvin*, 738 F.3d 1172, 1174 (9th Cir. 2013). Page argues that the ALJ should have considered his eligibility for this listing because (1) he was required to repeat the first grade, was in special education until he quit school in the ninth grade, and struggled with drug and alcohol abuse as a young teen, (2) he was tested with the Wechsler Adult

1 Intelligence Scale III, which resulted in a finding of a full scale IQ of 69, and (3) he
2 has a serious physical impairment of mild to moderate degenerative disc disease.

3 The Commissioner argues that the ALJ was not required to discuss listing
4 12.05C at step three because the ALJ determined Page's intellectual limitations
5 were not a severe limitation at step two. At step two, the ALJ assesses whether the
6 claimant has a "severe" impairment, i.e., one that significantly limits his physical
7 or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520. An impairment
8 may be found to be not severe when "medical evidence establishes only a slight
9 abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities which would have no more
10 than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work. SSR 85-28. Similarly, an
11 impairment is not severe if it does not significantly limit a claimant's physical or
12 mental ability to do basic work activities, which include the ability to understand,
13 remember, and carry out simple instructions, the ability to make simple work-
14 related decisions, the ability to respond appropriately to supervisors and coworkers,
15 and the ability to deal with changes in a routine work setting. *See* 20 C.F.R.
16 § 404.1522. If an impairment is not "severe," it need not be considered at step three.

17 The ALJ's determination that Page's intellectual limitations were not a severe
18 impairment is supported by substantial evidence in the record. The ALJ found that
19 the record as a whole showed that Page's intellectual limitations were no more than
20 moderate. AR 16. In support of this, the ALJ referred to Page's strong work history

1 for several years performing semi-skilled work—Page worked for nearly ten years
2 as a semi-skilled truck driver. The ALJ’s line of reasoning is also consistent with
3 the opinion of Dr. Severinghaus,² who stated that “[w]ith his work history and
4 adaptive skills, [Page’s] IQ might be best considered in the Borderline range.” AR
5 432. The ALJ further observed that Page “completes a range of tasks/activities
6 requiring concentration including household chores, driving, shopping, watching
7 television, and following the course of medical appointments/treatment.” AR 17–
8 18. This too supports the ALJ’s determination that Page’s intellectual impairment
9 was not “severe” within the meaning of the regulations.

10 Page is correct that the ALJ’s determination was not well articulated.
11 However, “[e]ven when an agency explains its decision with ‘less than ideal clarity’
12 [the court] must uphold it ‘if the agency’s path may reasonably be discerned.’”
13 *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1121 (quoting *Alaska Dep’t of Env’tl. Conservation v. EPA*, 540
14 U.S. 461, 497 (2004)). The ALJ’s discussion at step two makes clear that the ALJ
15 did not find the limitations to Page’s adaptive functioning sufficient to constitute a
16 severe impairment.

17
18
19
20 ² The ALJ did not consider the opinion of Dr. Severinghaus because it was issued
before the relevant date. However, Page urges that the ALJ should have considered
his opinion, as discussed below.

B. The ALJ did not err in finding Page’s symptom testimony not credible.

Page asserts that the ALJ erred by discrediting his symptom testimony. The ALJ engages in a two-step analysis to determine whether a claimant’s testimony regarding subjective pain or symptoms is credible. “First, the ALJ must determine whether there is objective medical evidence of an underlying impairment which could reasonably be expected to produce the pain or other symptoms alleged.” *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1112. Second, “[i]f the claimant meets the first test and there is no evidence of malingering, the ALJ can only reject the claimant’s testimony about the severity of the symptoms if [the ALJ] gives ‘specific, clear and convincing reasons’ for the rejection.” *Ghanim v. Colvin*, 763 F.3d 1154, 1163 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Lingenfelter v. Astrue*, 504 F.3d 1028, 1036 (9th Cir. 2007)). An ALJ must make sufficiently specific findings “to permit the court to conclude that the ALJ did not arbitrarily discredit [the] claimant’s testimony.” *Tommasetti v. Astrue*, 533 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2008) (citations omitted). General findings are insufficient. *Lester v. Chater*, 81 F.3d 821, 834 (9th Cir. 1995). Courts may not second-guess an ALJ’s findings that are supported by substantial evidence. *Id.*

In making an adverse credibility determination, an ALJ may consider, among other things, (1) the claimant’s reputation for truthfulness; (2) inconsistencies in the claimant’s testimony or between his testimony and his conduct; (3) the claimant’s daily living activities; (4) the claimant’s work record; and (5) the nature, severity,

1 and effect of the claimant's condition. *Thomas v. Barnhart*, 278 F.3d 947, 958–59
2 (9th Cir. 2002).

3 Page alleged that he suffered from “nerve pain” including back and neck pain
4 and pain radiating into his extremities. At the hearing, Page testified that his pain
5 and symptoms limit his ability to perform daily activities. He asserted that he is able
6 to stand or walk for only five or ten minutes at a time and that he has to lie down
7 for 20 minutes to an hour each day. AR 75. He rated the severity of his pain at an 8
8 or higher on a scale of 1–10 and sometimes at a “15.” AR 74. Page described having
9 trouble with postural activities such as stooping/bending over or squatting as well
10 as lifting/carrying objects. AR 75–76. He testified that he has issues with
11 concentration because of pain and that he cannot watch television for longer than
12 15 minutes without having to get up and walk around to alleviate the pain. AR 78.
13 He indicated that his conditions limit his daily living activities and testified that he
14 does not do much around the house except light chores, driving to the store, and
15 shopping. AR 79–80.

16 The ALJ found that Page's medically determinable impairments could
17 reasonably be expected to cause the alleged symptoms. AR 19. Nonetheless, the
18 ALJ still provided specific, clear, and convincing reasons to discount Page's
19 testimony. *See Burrell v. Colvin*, 775 F.3d 1133, 1137 (9th Cir. 2014).

1 First, the ALJ found that the record showed Page had a history of
2 exaggerating the severity of his symptoms. For example, Dr. Shanks observed that
3 Page had a “significant overreaction to even the lightest palpation” and exhibited a
4 larger-than-reported range of motion when his attention was diverted elsewhere.
5 AR 540. Likewise, Dr. Bender reported that Mr. Page displayed “exaggerated” and
6 “hypersensitive” reactions on exams and presented with “shaking spells that
7 seem[ed] somewhat volitional.” AR 665. Neurosurgeon Cynthia Hahn, M.D. also
8 observed that Page was “quite demonstrative” and jumped visibly in an evaluation.
9 AR 622. The ALJ therefore reasonably discounted Page’s symptom reporting based
10 on the evidence in the record indicating his disproportionate pain reporting.

11 The ALJ also discounted Page’s testimony because he failed to follow
12 treatment recommendations. AR 22, 24. “The ALJ may consider many factors in
13 weighing a claimant’s credibility,” including “unexplained or inadequately
14 explained failure to seek treatment or to follow a prescribed course of treatment.”
15 *Tommasetti*, 533 F.3d at 1039. The ALJ noted that Page declined to allow nerve
16 conduction testing, he was noncompliant with his recommended home physical
17 therapy exercises, and he refused a recommended psychiatric consult. AR 24.

18 Finally, the ALJ observed that Page made inconsistent statements about his
19 activity level. AR 24–25. A claimant’s reported daily activities can form the basis
20 for an adverse credibility determination if they consist of activities that contradict

1 the claimant's other testimony or if those activities are transferable to a work setting.
2 *Orn v. Astrue*, 495 F.3d 625, 639 (9th Cir. 2007). Page reported to his medical
3 providers that he was able to exercise 60 minutes per day and walked for an hour
4 per day. AR 613. He reported his functional activity level as 10, 8, and 7 out of 10,
5 with 10 being the highest level of activity. AR 690, 693, 699. He also reported that
6 he could mow the lawn and perform some household chores. AR 778. However, at
7 the hearing, Page testified that he could only walk two blocks and that he could
8 stand for about 5 to 10 minutes. AR 75. He also reported that it was hard for him to
9 walk. AR 76. The ALJ's decision to discount Page's reports based on these
10 inconsistencies was therefore reasonable.

11 .For these reasons, the ALJ's credibility finding is based on specific, clear,
12 and convincing reasons, which are supported by substantial evidence. The ALJ
13 therefore did not err in discounting Page's symptom testimony.

14 **C. The ALJ did not err in assigning weight to the medical opinion**
15 **evidence.**

16 Page argues that the ALJ failed to adequately consider the opinions of several
17 treating or examining medical providers Dr. Berdine Bender, MD, and Debra
18 Brown, PhD. ECF No. 12 at 14–17. There are three types of physicians: “(1) those
19 who treat the claimant (treating physicians); (2) those who examine but do not treat
20 the claimant (examining physicians); and (3) those who neither examine nor treat
the claimant [but who review the claimant's file] (nonexamining physicians).”

1 *Holohan v. Massanari*, 246 F.3d 1195, 1201–02 (9th Cir. 2001). Generally, a
2 treating physician’s opinion carries more weight than an examining physician’s,
3 and an examining physician’s opinion carries more weight than a nonexamining
4 physician’s. *Id.* at 1202. “In addition, the regulations give more weight to opinions
5 that are explained than to those that are not, and to the opinions of specialists
6 concerning matters relating to their specialty over that of nonspecialists.” *Id.*

7 If a treating or examining physician’s opinion is uncontradicted, the ALJ may
8 reject it only by offering “clear and convincing reasons that are supported by
9 substantial evidence.” *Bayliss v. Barnhart*, 427 F.3d 1211, 1216 (9th Cir. 2005).
10 However, the ALJ need not accept the opinion of any physician, including a treating
11 physician, if that opinion is brief, conclusory and inadequately supported by clinical
12 findings.” *Bray v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 554 F.3d 1219, 1228 (9th Cir. 2009).
13 “If a treating or examining doctor’s opinion is contradicted by another doctor’s
14 opinion, an ALJ may only reject it by providing specific and legitimate reasons that
15 are supported by substantial evidence.” *Bayliss*, 427 F.3d at 1216 (citing *Lester*, 81
16 F.3d 821, 830–31).

17 **1. The ALJ properly rejected the opinion of Dr. Bender.**

18 Page appears to assert that the ALJ improperly failed to consider the opinion
19 of his treating physician, Dr. Bender. ECF No. 12 at 14. The ALJ conducted the
20 hearing on August 6, 2015, and rendered a decision that same day. AR 10. Dr.

1 Bender's letter to the Social Security Administration is dated August 18, 2015.
2 Thus, this correspondence was not available to the ALJ for evaluation at the time
3 the ALJ issued the opinion. The ALJ could not have erred in failing to address this
4 testimony because it did not exist at the time the ALJ's decision.

5 Dr. Bender's opinion was considered by the Appeals Council. AR 2. The
6 Appeals Council found that the evidence—in conjunction with the other evidence
7 submitted—did not provide a basis to change the ALJ's decision. *Id.* “[W]hen a
8 claimant submits evidence for the first time to the Appeals Council . . . the new
9 evidence is part of the administrative record, which the district court must consider
10 in determining whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial
11 evidence.” *Brewes v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 682 F.3d 1157, 1159–60 (9th
12 Cir. 2012). Denial of remand is appropriate “notwithstanding the existence of new
13 evidence only when there would be substantial evidence supporting the ALJ's
14 denial of disability benefits even if the new evidence were credited and interpreted
15 as argued by the claimant.” *Gardner v. Berryhill*, 856 F.3d 652, 658 (9th Cir. 2017).

16 Even when Dr. Bender's opinion is considered, the ALJ's opinion is still
17 supported by substantial evidence. Dr. Bender's letter to the Social Security
18 Administration states in its entirety: “Mr. Patrick Paige [*sic*] is a patient in my
19 internal medicine office. At this time he is completely disabled and would not be
20 able to function at even sedentary work levels. Unfortunately he has a poor

1 prognosis for recovery.” AR 824. As the appeals council noted, the letter appears
2 to pertain to Page’s condition on August 18, 2015, which is not relevant to the
3 Appeals Council’s review of the ALJ’s decision. Further, even if the
4 correspondence were relevant, it is not entitled to any weight because it pertains to
5 only matters reserved for the Commissioner’s determination. *See* 20 C.F.R.
6 § 404.1527(e)(1), (3); *id.* § 416.1527(e)(1), (3) (the issue of whether a claimant is
7 able to work is reserved to the Commissioner); SSR 96-5p, 1996 WL 374183, at *2
8 (Jul. 2, 1996) (“[T]reating source opinions on issues that are reserved to the
9 Commissioner are never entitled to controlling weight or special significance.”).

10 **2. The ALJ properly rejected the opinion of Debra Brown, PhD.**

11 Page next argues that the ALJ erred in assigning the medical opinion
12 evidence of Dr. Brown little weight. ECF No. 12 at 15. Dr. Brown evaluated Page
13 in January 2013 and found that Page had marked to severe limitations in several
14 occupational function areas. Dr. Brown’s opinion is contradicted by the opinions of
15 Anita Anderson, PhD, and Michael Brown, PhD, who found that Page was capable
16 of limited work with certain cognitive limitations. Accordingly, the ALJ needed to
17 identify specific and legitimate reasons supported by substantial evidence to
18 discredit Dr. Brown’s opinions. *Bayliss*, 427 F.3d at 1216.

19 First, the ALJ noted that Dr. Brown’s opinion was not supported by objective
20 evidence. AR 27. On examination, Dr. Brown observed no indications of a formal

1 thought disorder of psychotic process. AR 529. She observed that Page's speech
2 was logical and that he was cooperative and displayed an appropriate affect. AR
3 532. She noted that Page had no impairments in perception, memory, insight or
4 judgment. AR 532. Dr. Brown indicated some impairment in Page's concentration,
5 reasoning and fund of knowledge. AR 533. The ALJ reasonably concluded that
6 these findings were inconsistent with the degree of severity indicated in the check-
7 box portion of the opinion.

8 The ALJ next noted that, in the absence of objective evidence, Dr. Brown's
9 conclusions were based on Page's self-reporting. AR 27. Although the examination
10 notes do not make this clear, the ALJ inferred as much based on the notable
11 discrepancy between the examination notes and the disabilities indicated on the
12 check-box portion of the opinion. An ALJ may reject even a treating physician's
13 opinion "if it is based to a large extent on a claimant's self-reports that have been
14 properly discounted as incredible." *Tommasetti*, 533 F.3d at 1041.

15 The ALJ also noted that the check-box portion of the opinion was
16 inconsistent with the Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) rating of 51 that Dr.
17 Brown had assigned to Page. Dr. Brown attributed Page's GAF rating of 51 to
18 "moderate impairment in social, educational, and occupational functioning." AR
19 531. The ALJ correctly concluded that this assessment is inconsistent with Dr.

1 Brown's later indication that Page suffered from marked to severe occupational
2 limitations. AR 27.

3 Finally, the ALJ discounted Dr. Brown's opinion because it was not
4 consistent with Page's counseling treatment notes, which reflected only moderate
5 depression and anxiety. AR 27. Further, the ALJ noted that Page's records indicated
6 generally normal psychiatric screenings without indication of debilitating
7 symptoms of significant cognitive complaints. *See* AR 548, 632. Page argues that
8 Dr. Brown's opinion should be given more weight than the routine screenings
9 performed by Page's other physicians because Dr. Brown is a mental health
10 specialist. ECF No. 12 at 17. However, an ALJ is allowed to consider an opinion
11 against the weight of the record as a whole. *Cf. Reddick v. Chater*, 157 F.3d 715
12 (9th Cir. 1998) (noting that an ALJ may reject medical testimony based on specific
13 reasons supported by the record as a whole).

14 **3. The ALJ properly discounted the opinions of other evaluators**
15 **predating the relevant period.**

16 Page argues that the ALJ "declared a wholesale rejection of the
17 opinions . . . that predate the relevant period." While evidence concerning
18 ailments outside the relevant time period can "support or elucidate the severity of
19 a condition," *Pyland v. Apfel*, 149 F.3d 873, 878 (8th Cir. 1998), there is no
20 requirement that the ALJ consider evidence from outside the relevant period, *see*
Carmickle v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin., 533 F.3d 1155, 1165 (9th Cir. 2008).

1 Further, Page has not shown how an analysis of these opinions would change the
2 outcome. Thus, even if the ALJ erred in failing to consider the opinions, Page has
3 not met his burden to show harmful error.

4 **D. Because the ALJ acted properly, the Court does not address Page’s**
5 **harmful error argument.**

6 Page argues that the ALJ’s alleged errs caused “ancillary errors” in the step-
7 five assessment of his ability to work because the testimony from the vocational
8 expert was based on an improper hypothetical. The ALJ’s hypothetical must be
9 based on medical assumptions supported by substantial evidence in the record that
10 reflects all of the claimant’s limitations. *Osenbrook v. Apfel*, 240 F.3d 1157, 1165
11 (9th Cir. 2001). The hypothetical should be “accurate, detailed, and supported by
12 the medical record.” *Tackett v. Apfel*, 180 F.3d 1094, 1101 (9th Cir. 1999).

13 Page’s argument assumes that the ALJ erred in evaluating his impairments,
14 the medical evidence, and his symptom testimony. For reasons discussed
15 throughout this decision, the ALJ’s hypotheticals to the vocational expert were
16 based on evidence and reasonably reflected Page’s limitations. Thus, the ALJ’s
17 findings are supported by substantial evidence and are legally sufficient.

18 **VI. CONCLUSION**

19 For the reasons discussed, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

20 **1. Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 12, is DENIED.**


1 2. The Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 15**, is
2 **GRANTED.**

3 3. **JUDGMENT** is to be entered in the Defendant's favor.

4 4. The case shall be **CLOSED.**

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and
6 provide copies to all counsel.

7 **DATED** this 28th day of March 2018.

8
9 
10 SALVADOR MENDOZA, JR.
 United States District Judge